

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on August 22, 2006, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 24, 29, 34, and 39 are amended to provide clarification and claims 27, 32, 37 and 42 are canceled. Claims 24-26, 28-31, 38-41 and 43 remain pending in this application.

35 USC §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 24 – 43 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,370,599 to Anand et al. (“Anand”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,928,372 to Yoshida (“Yoshida”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claims 24, 29, 34, and 39 are drawn to a method, apparatus, article and system, respectively, capable of verifying a security association (SA) received by a network adapter for encoding and/or decoding data. Independent claims 24, 29, 34, and 39 have been amended to clarify that the first integrity indicator is “computed from said SA.” Support for this amendment may be found in the present application, for example, on page 6, line 15. To provide further clarification, independent claims 24, 29, 34, and 39 have also been amended to recite “transferring the SA to an encoder/decoder in the network adapter to enable at least one of encoding of data from said IHA using said SA before transmitting said data to a network infrastructure device and decoding of data received from said network infrastructure device using said SA.” Support for this amendment may be found in the present application, for example, on page 8, lines 5-8. Independent claims 24, 29, 34, and 39 have been further amended to incorporate the subject matter of respective dependent claims 27, 32, 37 and 42, namely “indicating, by said network adapter, the integrity of said SA to said IHA.”

Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to apply the teachings of Yoshida to Anand to produce the claimed invention. The teachings of Yoshida are limited to verifying data transferred between a data processor and an external recording unit (e.g., a disk drive using an ATA interface). The Office Action characterizes Yoshida as teaching the data verification of data sent between a processor and a peripheral device. Applicants respectfully submit that Yoshida does not define the data verification

problem this broadly. Even in the “Field of the Invention,” Yoshida states that “[t]his invention relates to a method and an apparatus for verifying a data transfer in a data processor equipped with an external recording unit.” More specifically, Yoshida addresses a problem of data verification for data transfer between a data processor and an external recording unit in accordance with an Advanced Technology Attachment (ATA) interface (see col. 1, lines 19-50). In fact, Yoshida specifically states “[t]he aim of the present invention is to provide a method and apparatus for verifying transfer data in a data processor equipped with an external recording unit having an ATA interface... while being compatible with the conventional ATA interface specification” (see col. 1, lines 53-59). Nothing in Yoshida suggests the desirability of using these data verification techniques, developed specifically for external recording units using an ATA interface, to verify a security association transferred to a network adapter for encoding and/or decoding data transmitted and/or received by the network adapter.

The NIC in Anand is not an external recording unit that uses an ATA interface. Moreover, implementing the data verification techniques of Yoshida in the system of Anand would likely require verification of all data transferred to the NIC. Anand describes a purpose of offloading computing tasks “for increasing the efficiency, speed and/or throughput of a computer system.” If the data verification techniques of Yoshida were applied to the system of Anand and all data transferred to the NIC was verified in the manner disclosed by Yoshida, the efficiency, speed and/or throughput of system of Anand would likely be decreased significantly. Because this would render the system of Anand unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, applicants submit that this proposed modification and combination would not have been obvious. See MPEP 2143.01(V).

Because one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Yoshida with Anand to produce the methods, apparatus, article, and system recited in independent claims 24, 29, 34, and 39, applicants submit that these independent claims, and the claims dependent therefrom, would not have been obvious. Accordingly, applicants request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (603-668-6560) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2121.

Respectfully submitted,

AVRAHAM MUALEM ET AL.

By their Representatives,

Customer Number: 45459

Telephone Number: 603-668-6560

By /Kevin J. Carroll
Kevin J. Carroll
Reg. No. 36,384